

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 203

TM 003 875

AUTHOR Klein, Susan S.
TITLE What is R and D Personnel Competency Assessment?
PUB DATE [Apr 74]
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (59th Chicago, Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Certification; *Comparative Analysis; *Educational Researchers; Evaluation; *Evaluation Techniques; Professional Training; Research Skills; *Teacher Evaluation; Tests

IDENTIFIERS *Performance Based Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A comparison of research and development and teacher competency assessment activities is divided into two tasks: (1) selection and cataloging of competencies; and (2) development of instruments and procedures to assess competencies for diagnostic training and selection. Similarities and differences in selecting and cataloging teacher competencies and for development, dissemination, and evaluation (DD and E) personnel are discussed. The two tasks involves similar difficulties. The differences are primarily in scope, research base, and ease of measuring the end product. In task 2, the discussion of similarities of, and differences between the competency assessment of these two groups focuses on job specific knowledge and skill for specific diagnostic purposes, rather than general predictive purposes. Diagnostic and selection (certification) instruments are discussed and their relationship to both teachers and DD and E personnel is evaluated. A list of common competency assessment instruments for both groups is included. A discussion of the development of, and need for competency assessment procedures concludes the report. (SE)

ED 095203

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT IS R&D PERSONNEL COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT?

SUSAN S. KLEIN

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D. C., 20208

PAPER PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

CHICAGO, 1974

DRAFT

The views expressed herein are those of the author
and do not necessarily represent the policies or
opinions of the National Institute of Education

TM 003 875

"WHAT IS R&D PERSONNEL COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT?"

by

Dr. Susan S. Klein

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Institute of Education

The purpose of this paper is to provide background and contextual information for this symposium on "Educational R&D Personnel Competency Assessment: What Is Its Future?" I will do this by reviewing 1. The symposium objectives, 2. A general definition of R&D Personnel competency assessment, 3. The National Institute of Education's (NIE's) interest in R&D personnel competency assessment, and 4. The differences and similarities between R&D Personnel and teacher competency assessment activities.

SYMPOSIUM OBJECTIVES

The major objectives of this symposium are to: 1. Familiarize educational R&D personnel with past and current work in the development of educational R&D competency assessment instruments and procedures, 2. Conduct a public discussion of the strengths, weaknesses and potential side effects of R&D competency assessment activities, 3. Elicit participation from the R&D community in the submission and development of competency objectives, test items and suggested user needs, and 4. Encourage R&D professionals to recommend future emphases in the R&D competency area.

This discussion and the presentation by Dr. Hood are primarily directed to objective 1, to familiarize educational R&D personnel with past and present work in the development of educational R&D competency assessment instruments and procedures. The discussants and other listeners or readers are encouraged to help us fulfill objectives 2, 3 and 4.

DEFINITION OF R&D PERSONNEL COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT

R&D personnel competency assessment is the systematic delineation and measurement of knowledge and skills deemed necessary to perform in the process areas of educational research, development, dissemination, evaluation, planning, R&D management and related functions. R&D performers include: (1) R&D professionals who have full-time education related R&D responsibilities in R&D organizations and associations and in R&D units in Federal Education Agencies, (FEAs): Higher Education Agencies (HEAs); State Education Agencies, (SEAs); Intermediate Education Agencies, (IEAs); Local Education Agencies, (LEAs); or education-related industries; and (2) Part-time R&D performers such as education practitioners (administrators and teachers). Sample R&D competencies include designing an information search, conducting a field test, and analyzing a marketing study. Specific R&D competencies have been identified in R&D personnel assessment studies by Hood, 1971; Schalock, 1972; Worthen, 1973; Stufflebeam, 1973; Bunda, 1973; and Paisley, 1973.

These studies suggest that the performance of educational R&D requires more than a high I.Q. and an understanding of relevant substantive areas such as human development, science education and linguistics. Special R&D competencies are needed in addition to other basic attributes such as intelligence, human relations expertise and knowledge of the educational substantive area.

The personnel competency assessment approach is dependent upon well-defined potentially critical objectives and differs from the ^{fully} credential, knowledge-based, or experiential approach which are based heavily on educational experiences and provide only vague guidance for various instructional or employment placement decisions.

NIE'S INTEREST IN R&D PERSONNEL COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT

The Research Training Program in the U. S. Office of Education (OE) and later NIE initiated major research and development projects in the R&D personnel and training area, to improve the quality of performance of individuals involved in education research and development. The research projects such as the AERA "A Study of Selected Factors Related to the Training of Researchers, Developers, Diffusers, and Evaluators in Education" by Worthen, et al, 1971, and "The Oregon Studies in Educational RDD&E" by Schalock et al at Teaching Research, 1972 were primarily directed to examine the emerging domains of education development, dissemination

and evaluation (D,D&E) and the functions or competencies of individuals involved in work in these areas.

The R&D personnel development projects as exemplified by the three model D,D&E consortia were supposed to make their training programs and materials as competency based as possible. The Ohio State University Evaluation Consortia's initial survey work in attempting to delineate evaluation competencies for inclusion in their training program was discussed at the 1973 AERA convention by Drs. Mary Ann Bunda and Daniel Stufflebeam of the project. The Far West Laboratory D,D&E consortia project was designed according to a "Functional Competence" model for D,D&E based on some pilot research on D,D&E employee functions in the West Coast area. Potential user assessment procedures were outlined to complement the competency based modules and the engineered internship training model, but they have not been fully implemented because the instructional modules and training procedures are still being developed.

After the spring 1973 review of the program we decided to ask Dr. Hood to put more energy into his promising competency assessment procedures and to develop the foundations for a generic rather than Far West Lab specific D,D&E competency assessment system. We felt that this system would be an important conceptual organizer and evaluation tool for future NIE work in the R&D personnel development area.

Although Dr. Hood is not planning to complete these funded activities until early 1975, it is essential that we examine this project (Hood et al, 1973) as well as the future of R&D personnel competency assessment activities at this time and make some conscious decisions. The timing is crucial since the R&D Personnel Development program in NIE was abolished in November 1973 due to budget limitations.

If the R&D Personnel program focus is not reestablished, it is unlikely that NIE will want to continue R&D competency assessment activities unless they have potential value to other NIE competency assessment, research or development needs.¹

COMPARISON OF R&D AND TEACHER COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

This discussion of comparisons between R&D and teacher competency assessment activities will be organized around Dr. Hood's major tasks, the selection and cataloging of competencies, and the development of instruments and procedures to assess competencies for diagnostic training and certification/selection purposes.

SELECTION AND CATALOGING OF COMPETENCIES

The similarities of the difficulty and immensity of this basic competency identification task for R&D personnel and teacher

1 However, the new permanent director of the NIE Office with responsibility for R&D resources may want to reconsider the decision to curtail the R&D Personnel Development Program activities. It is also possible that work on the development of these R&D personnel competency assessment procedures may guide, augment or complement work in the area of teacher and administrator competency assessment and be continued in that NIE context.

competency assessment are great. The differences are primarily in scope, research base and ease of measuring the end product.

Similarities

The following description of the competency assessment approach as being dependent upon "well defined cognitive, performance or consequence objectives and functional criteria or standards" (Houston, 1973) applies both to R&D and teacher competency assessment.

Dodl's definition in the Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies, 1972 emphasizing teacher relevant "functional abilities which teachers must exercise in the conduct of their job related activities" would also be an appropriate description of R&D competencies if the teacher focus were expanded to include other education personnel with D,D&E functions. The major problem with delineating competencies in both teaching and R&D areas is that both the above definition and the term 'competency' imply that the "well defined objectives" or the "relevant functional abilities" have a value or effectiveness connotation and do or are likely to promote positive change in their eventual clients. Cataloguers or researchers of competencies in the educational D,D&E area have the same difficulties as teacher competency cataloguers or researchers in identifying or isolating critical competencies for given generic circumstances which have a positive effect in education or even those which are associated with exemplary or nonexemplary D,D&E personnel or teachers.

Both professional areas also have the similar problem of identifying knowledge and skills which are specific to their functional concerns and not identical to general adult intelligence, human relations skills, etc. Both teacher and DD&E competency areas also suffer from "false labeling practices" i.e., instructional objectives or tasks are generally assumed to be competencies, but few are validated and many may be at best random indicators of associated variables rather than competencies themselves.

Written competency catalogs have been, or are being prepared for both teaching and R&D areas. The Dodd et al Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies is one of the first and best known teacher competency catalogs although other states such as Georgia and individuals such as Turner et al. (A General Catalog of Teaching Skills) have developed other versions. Dr. Hood and the Far West Lab project staff are developing an R&D competency catalog. Since few, if any, competencies rather than common tasks or objectives in either the teaching or D,D&E functional areas have been identified with certainty based on evidence of effectiveness it is only possible to assemble catalogs of "potential" or "best bet" common functions or tasks which may be competencies. We don't know the extent to which these professional functions or tasks are sets of skills and knowledge, or critical independent skills or what the universe of skills is from which the D,D&E or teacher catalog developers might sample.

Also, since empirical evidence is not available on which to base decisions on competencies, the catalog developers must partially rely on trying to secure the agreement of experts in the chosen areas (who often achieve their expert status by emphasizing their own unique approaches).

However, the drive to identify common functions and eventually competencies in both the R&D and teaching areas should facilitate the research into teacher or D,D&E personnel effectiveness. Then, as the proposed competencies are stated and assessed, they may either be refuted or validated. It is also hoped that catalogs of "best bet" competencies will help developers and users of training materials. Dr. Hood is planning to make the D,D&E competency catalog useful to other developers of training materials, trainers, employers and students by cross referencing instructional materials and assessment instruments. In Resources for Performance Based Education, instructional materials were cross referenced with the competencies from the Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies.

Differences

The major difference between identifying D,D&E and teacher competencies is that the scope of D,D&E competencies is more limited and the end products (consequences or outcomes) of D,D&E functions are easier to analyze than the more distal student outcomes which result from teacher behavior and many other factors. If job competency assessments range from

"easy to identify" "static," "simple" competencies for jobs like key punch operator to extremely "difficult to identify" "adaptive" and very "wide ranging" competencies for teachers, it is likely that D,D&E competencies fall somewhere between these extremes. Teachers are generally expected to have teaching skills and significant knowledge about various content areas or disciplines, while it is not unusual for D,D&E personnel to be encouraged to function "across" subjects or as members of teams with content experts.

Dr. Hood has limited his project's R&D competency assessment in two additional ways. 1. Priority was placed on assessing the more nascent function of D,D&E rather than the large fairly well established, but varied, areas of research. 2. Priority was also placed on assessing entry level skills of D,D&E professionals.² Teacher competency statements are rarely separated according to teacher experience levels. A model that is starting to do this, i.e., the Far West Lab "Training System for Staff of Early Childhood Education Programs" designated competencies according to career ladder functions. In this system the beginning teacher assistants master child related competencies such as using games and toys as learning experiences.

2 Since R&D professionals are such a small group, the project is being encouraged to also examine D,D&E functions of other education personnel such as teachers and administrators.

and the more advanced professionals in charge of the child center, master administrative, curriculum development and evaluation competencies.

Other differences between the identification of teaching or D,D&E competencies may be attributed to differences in the research base for each. In the D,D&E area there have been fewer research studies, but those that do exist are more comprehensive than many of the teacher effectiveness studies. Research in both areas focuses on personnel characteristics, job functions, and more recently impact variables such as student behaviors and achievement. Dr. Hood will attempt to include only research based tasks or competencies in the D,D&E catalog and reference the source of evidence for each.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES, AND INSTRUMENTS FOR DIAGNOSTIC AND CERTIFICATION/SELECTION PURPOSES

Assumptions

In this section an attempt will be made to state the assumptions underlying this discussion of R&D and teacher competency instruments and procedures and then give examples of similarities and differences between the two areas. A basic assumption which is stated briefly in the definition of R&D personnel competency assessment and also applies to teacher competency assessment is that instruments and procedures can be developed and used to assess "trainable" competencies which professionals can learn to master. It is further assumed that these "professional" competencies

11

are in addition to specified underlying competencies or abilities. Thus, this discussion of teaching and D,D&E competency assessment procedures and instruments will focus on the assessment of specific job-related competencies which adult professionals are likely to learn rather than more innate abilities (such as intelligence) or general underlying skills such as the ability to write. These underlying "predictive" traits or skills are extremely important but for simplification it will be assumed that more general higher education selection procedures and educational experiences will assure that most teachers or R&D professionals possess minimum competence in these basic areas and that additional specific job relevant competencies (or functions) need to, and can be assessed and learned. Thus, this discussion of similarities and differences between teacher and R&D personnel competencies and their assessment will focus on the assessment of job specific knowledges and skills for specific diagnostic and certification purposes rather than more general predictive purposes.

It is also assumed that both teacher and R&D employers or trainers have a substantial need for user oriented diagnostic and certification/selection procedures and instruments which are more appropriate than many of the existing unvalidated research instruments. Since progress in developing competency assessment procedures and instruments is in early stages in both the teaching and D,D&E area, it is assumed that knowledge and experience gained from the D,D&E assessment

work can be used by teacher competency assessment people and vice versa.

It is also assumed that the D,D&E competency assessment problems may be easier to solve than the teacher competency assessment problems because, as discussed in the preceding section on the identification of competencies, the scope and degree of abstractness of D,D&E competencies may be more limited and thus easier to measure.

In analyzing similarities and differences between existing teacher and D,D&E competency assessment procedures and instruments, measures ranging from diagnostic job interest inventories to certification assessments based on user impact results will be discussed. Often the same instruments can be used by different types of raters (self, supervisor, student) and for both diagnostic or certification/selection/qualification purposes.

Diagnostic Instruments

For both teachers and D,D&E personnel, the most common diagnostic needs are related to training opportunities. Thus, many assessment systems are tied to instruction and instructional management. The Far West Lab D,D&E functional competency assessment system was originally designed to be a part of a functional competency training programs, and many of the teacher competency assessment systems are training

program³ and training module specific (e.g., Weber State and the State of Florida). Colleges of Education like the Florida International University are even developing a computer managed instructional/assessment systems.

I know of no job interest inventory instruments specifically directed to assessing career interest in the various education related professions such as teaching or D,D&E or of assessing interest or aptitudes in the subspecialties of these professions. However, some instruments like the D,D&E self-administered Q Sort and the Texas Center COMPASS, Comprehensive Personnel Assessment battery are designed to diagnose student/employee strengths and weaknesses. Both teacher and D,D&E diagnostic instruments are quite "Achievement" versus "Aptitude" based since the items are usually contingent upon past experiences and knowledge.

Most teacher diagnostic instruments like COMPASS or the older Minn. Teacher Attitude Inventory, etc. have been used with preservice rather than inservice teachers. However, Dr. Gordon Lawrence at the University of Florida has been developing a diagnostic system for inservice Competency Based Teacher Education (CBTE) to be used by teachers with each other in a peer panel system rather than by supervisors, instructors

3 In some cases such as for Flinders' Interaction Analysis, assessment and diagnosis of teaching and feedback to teacher are primary teacher training strategies.

or other raters or observers. The inventory part of this battery has been validated by classroom observation. Other parts of the battery are integral components of the inservice training system and assess module specific more than generic competencies.

The D,D&E diagnostic battery is being developed to be used by both D,D&E students and D,D&E employees. In addition to self ratings as used in the Florida CBTE inservice assessment system, the D,D&E batteries to be composed of a supervisor rating instrument, a knowledge test and some application or skill tests. The Far West Lab staff is attempting to make their generic diagnostic D,D&E instruments "fun" and very usable by helping users develop personal profiles and by following an adaptive assessment procedure. By adaptive assessment, individual strengths or weaknesses are diagnosed by broad scope instruments and specific instruments are used to probe more deeply into specific areas of strength or weakness, as desired.

There are some salient differences between validation procedure used for teacher and D,D&E diagnostic instruments. The teacher instruments are frequently validated by student ratings where the D,D&E diagnostic and certification instruments are to be used along with other evidence to validate each other. For D,D&E personnel assessment, unlike many teacher assessment systems, students' judgments would only be measured indirectly by the product assessment part of the battery.

Certification/Selection Instruments

In discussing teacher and D,D&E assessment instruments, the major difference between diagnostic and certification/selection instruments is that diagnostic instruments are likely to attempt to sample from a wider universe in less detail than instruments used for specific certification or selection purposes and that certification procedures put greater emphasis on consequence or impact objectives than diagnostic procedures. Thus, Dr. Hood is developing certification instruments in the narrower development, rather than the more inclusive D,D&E area and he is planning to include a product rating instrument stage in the certification battery.

The teacher and D,D&E assessment instruments vary somewhat according to the source of evidence, type of evidence and context in which the evidence is assessed. For teachers direct sources of evidence frequently include: 1. students (student ratings of the teacher or student knowledge or other gain scores resulting from teacher directed treatments) 2. teachers themselves or their peers 3. job supervisors or instructors (using ratings according to given standards) and 4. "neutral" observers of performance or knowledge test scorers.

As seen by the accompanying chart listing "Types of Common Competency Assessment Instruments" the sources of evidence used by the Far West Lab D,D&E instrument developers are limited to 1. self reports of D,D&E personnel, 2. supervisor or trainer ratings and 3. neutral scorers of knowledge, perform

TEACHING ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

- 1) Ratings or Appraisals
 - Student Ratings of Teachers
 - Teacher Self Assessment
 - Teacher Peer Assessment
 - Supervisor or Instructor Ratings of Teacher
- 2) Knowledge Tests
 - Knowledge Tests about Teaching and Content areas
- 3) Performance Assessment.
 - Assessment of Teacher Planning and Preparation for Instruction*
 - Assessment of Teacher Performance in Assessing Pupil Learning*
 - Assessment of Teacher Performance During Instruction - Interaction with Students in the following contexts:
 - a. Simulation
 - b. Practice Teaching
 - c. Naturalistic Classroom
 - with Random Content, etc.
 - with Controlled Content (for comparative evaluation purposes)
- 4) Analysis of Intended Effects.
 - Analysis of Teacher Impact on Student Gains (short and long term) by:
 - a. Criterion Tests
 - b. Norm Referenced Tests (for comparative purposes)

*Many of these teacher competencies may be identical to some D,D&E competencies

COMMON COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

D,D&E ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS
(being developed by ERL)

..... 1) Ratings or Appraisals

D,D&E Personnel Self Ratings (Q Sort)

Supervisor or Instructor Ratings (Q Sort)

..... 2) Knowledge Tests

D,D&E Job Knowledge Tests (comprehension and
some application)

..... 3) Performance Assessment

Assessments of Job Samples (Performance Exercises)
or
Job Simulations - Based on Related Job Samples

Following

..... 4) Analysis of Intended Effects

Work Product Ratings

Based on Evidence of Product Effectiveness
(It is difficult to measure comparative effects,
unless individuals are asked to develop the same
products with the same resources.)

o some D,D&E competencies.

tests and D,D&E products.

As mentioned above, the types of evidence range from subjective ratings or appraisals to more neutral process oriented coding of performance functions to various analyses of the performance or the resultant products. As seen by the accompanying chart, evidence of both knowledge and skills are used for teacher and D,D&E competency assessment. The bulk of the performance evidence sought for teachers has been primarily evidence relating to processes used in performance situations. The D,D&E performance focuses more on the intermediate results of the D,D&E function than the process i.e., more on what the D,D&E person did than how it was done. The assessment of intended effects is difficult for both teachers and D,D&E personnel, but more attention has been given to the measurement of student behavior based on residual gain scores for criterion and norm referenced tests than for assessing the effects of development evaluation or dissemination activities. Of these D,D&E effects more progress has been made in evaluating development products than the results of the other dissemination and evaluation activities.

The context of the assessments for the various teaching or D,D&E performance functions are apt to be important considerations in the assessment of individuals' competencies. For teachers the laboratory simulation to natural classroom context dimension is thought to be very important (as the complexity of the situation increases) and teachers are generally assessed

in several parts of this contextual range. For D,D&E personnel, it may be more important to sample the performances in a wide, diverse range of contexts such as institutional evaluation, product evaluation, program evaluation than in laboratory to naturalistic contexts. Another contextual dimension which is equally important to the assessment of teacher and D,D&E performance is the comparability dimension which assures that the performance tasks and other "inputs" are similar for the different individuals assessed.

It is usually easier to maintain this treatment/context comparability in the simulation assessment situations than in more naturalistic work situations although Ned Flanders' plan (Flanders, 1973) to do this for teachers with an "Evaluative Teaching Unit" seems plausible and the idea easier to replicate in a D,D&E than in a classroom setting.

Development of, and Need for Competency Assessment Procedures

The need for some valid competency assessment batteries and procedures for both teaching and D,D&E functions is great. Although many instruments have been used to measure various competencies or indicators of competencies for research purposes especially in the teaching area, very few of these instruments have been culled and incorporated into competence assessment batteries for either diagnostic or certification/selection purposes. The CBTE publications decry the deficit of appropriate competency based assessment systems, but even organizations like the National Commission on Performance Based Education which has a charter to collect information on teaching competence and its

measurement have not initiated a comprehensive assessment of CBTE assessment systems.

This Far West Lab project is the first activity to develop a diagnostic and assessment battery for the D,D&E area.

Examples of more generic rather than training program specific teacher competency assessment batteries include the research oriented battery being used in the California Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study and the Oregon battery developed by Del Schalock. The California instruments focus on underlying potential predictors (such as verbal aptitude, memory, reasoning, etc.) of teacher success in contributing to student English and math score gains as well as observational measures of teacher performance. The Schalock certification oriented procedures are designed to control some contextual differences by conducting rating type assessments during "formal" lessons and to examine evidence which is often neglected, i.e., teacher behaviors prior to and after classroom interaction, as well as during the class.

Presently the most common uses of these teacher and D,D&E assessment batteries are by schools of education. Most of these are informal batteries composed of instruments intended to examine an individual's knowledge (e.g, the National Teachers Exam, instructor course exams, masters and doctoral level exams, etc.). The competency based programs are now trying to measure some performance dimensions as well, but most of these performance test batteries are related to specific training and objectives rather t

more comprehensive generic competences. Although many states and even teachers' associations say they want teacher competency based assessment for initial if not recertification purposes, I know of no generic (non training program specific) state certification batteries which are administered to individual preservice or inservice teachers. Instead, states supporting CBE certify people who have completed CBE programs. However, there are frequent proposals to establish regional or national examining institutes to qualify individuals in a variety of competency levels for degrees and specific certification of job related skills (Hodgkinson, 1974). The idea of a comprehensive generic D,D&E competence certification system is not new. Two years ago a national debate on the pros and cons of evaluator certification was conducted at the AERA convention and the state of Tennessee has mandated competency based programs for administrators who often perform some D,D&E functions. (Rosner and Kay, 1974)

The potential consumers of assessment information on both teachers and R&D employees are similar. They include training institutions (for initial selection, ongoing diagnosis and final certification purposes), potential employers, and the direct recipients of the teaching or D,D&E services. Both teacher employers (usually school districts or universities) and R&D employers have not been accustomed to using individual certification batteries for initial professional employee selection or employee advancement but with the tight job

markets they may have more leverage to do this if any valid competency assessment batteries are available. The sophistication of non employer, but direct users of competency/certification information may differ for teachers and D,D&E personnel. The direct consumers of teacher services include students and their parent while the direct consumers of D,D&E services are usually the funding agencies like NIE, or the employers themselves if they are school districts or publishers. Both employers and many direct users of these education professionals' services would like a "report card" of summary assessment data. For example it has been suggested (Klein and Hopkins, 1971) that individuals that propose to do government work include RD,D&E competency profiles along with vita of principle project members. Others advocate making simple teacher competency profiles available to students and parents. Competency profiles might also be used for recruitment, placement and advancement decisions.

Summary

This has not been a complete examination of differences and similarities between teacher and R&D competency assessment instruments and procedures, but it is hoped that this initial comparison brings some salient issues into clearer focus so that the discussion of future development work in the D,D&E competency assessment area or the discussion of alternatives to this development can be addressed somewhat concretely.

REFERENCES

- Bunda, M. A., "A Partial Validation of the New Conceptualization of Evaluation Competencies," AERA Annual Meeting, Feb 1973.
- Dodl, N., Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies, Florida State University, 1972.
- Flanders, N. A., "The Changing Base of Performance-Based Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 312-3, Jan. 1974.
- Hodgkinson, H. as quoted in "Separate Credentials and Education, Hodgkinson tells AARE," Report on Education Research, March 13, 1974.
- Hood, P. et al., Design of A Functional Competence Training Program for Development, Dissemination and Evaluation Personnel at Professional and Paraprofessional Levels in Education, Far West Lab, 1970.
- Hood, P., Havassy B., Lash A., and Ward J., Development of Assessment Instruments for Competence-Based Education: The Educational Development, Diffusion and Evaluation Training Programs, Far West Lab, 1973.
- Houston, R., Resources for Performance Based Education, University of Houston, New York State Department, 1973.
- Klein, S. and J. Hopkins, "Executive Memorandum to Sec. of HEW on R&D Competency Assessment", 1971, unpublished.
- Lawrence, G. and D. DeNovellis, "A Measurement System for In-Service CBTE," AERA Annual Meeting, Chicago, April 1974.
- Paisley, W., Development of Training Resources for Educational Extension Service Personnel, Stanford University and System Development Corp., 1973, NIE Final Report OEC-0-72-4904.
- Rosner, B. and P. Kay, "Will the Promise of C/PBTE be Fulfilled?" Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 290-4, Jan. 1974.
- Schalock, H. D., et al. The Oregon Studies in Education Research Development, Diffusion, and Evaluation, Volume I-IV, Teaching Research - The Oregon State System of Higher Education, Final Report: Grant No. OEG-0-70-4977, March 1972.
- Stufflebeam, D. "A New Conceptualization of Evaluation Competencies," AERA Annual Meeting, Feb. 1973.

Turner, R., et al., A General Catalog of Teaching Skills,
Indiana University, 1973.

Worthen, B., et al., A Study of Selected Factors Related
to the Training of Researchers, Developers, Diffusers,
and Evaluators in Education, Final Report, Grant No.
OEC-0-71-0017 (520), November 1971.